

TAB

DDS&T 5985-79

3 December 1979

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM: Leslie C. Dirks
Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT: NAPA Project Group Report, Tab D: Authorities
of the Director of Personnel

1. This memorandum responds to your request that each member of the Executive Committee address the pros and cons of the options set forth in Tab D of the NAPA Project Group Report aimed at strengthening the personnel policy control and enforcement posture of the Agency (U)

2. First, an intelligent and productive discussion of this issue should be based on a much better understanding of the specific problems which have or may have resulted from the alleged "weak enforcement posture" of the Office of Personnel. The NAPA Project Group Report unfortunately cites nothing more than a "lack of assurance" that the personnel system is being applied fairly and that regulations are being followed. (U)

3. Given this, my views on the pros and cons of the various options are as follows:

Option A -- Leave the Office of Personnel intact, but specifically identify the Director of Personnel's control and enforcement authorities in the areas of promotion, assignment and evaluation.

Advantages: a, b, c as cited in the NAPA Project Group Report.

Disadvantages: In my view, the disadvantages cited by the NAPA Project Group are invalid -- the specific identification of added enforcement responsibilities need not and should not be accomplished in a way which requires modification each time one of the cited parties is replaced. Moreover, there is no reason why reporting on enforcement functions to the DDCI

SUBJECT: NAPA Project Group Report, Tab D: Authorities of the Director of Personnel

cannot be through the DDA as with everything else. However, one possible disadvantage of this option, not cited by the NAPA Project Group, is that it "doesn't stir up the pot enough" which is sometimes necessary for real change to take place (assuming change is needed). In my view, though, the better way to "stir up the pot" is through personnel shifts, not organizational ones.

Option B -- Organizationally transfer ~~of~~ personnel policy monitoring, control and enforcement functions from the Office of Personnel to the DCI level. It is understood these functions would include human resource analysis, position management, personnel planning, and personnel management evaluation.

Advantages: a, b as cited in the Project Group Report. Regarding advantages c and d claimed by the Project Group, I find it inconceivable that those assurances could not be given without the proposed transfer. That is, the promised assurances could surely be given without resorting to organizational changes. To claim otherwise would be to indict the DDA for incompetence.

Disadvantages: a through e as cited in the Project Group Report. Also, this proposal would entail the creation of a second IG-like component at the DCI level and perhaps lead to unwarranted competition and duplication. (On the other hand, a somewhat similar set of circumstances years ago led to the division of the Office of Finance into what is now the Office of the Comptroller and the current Office of Finance. After a period of some difficulty this arrangement settled down and has worked well.) Another disadvantage of this option is that it would place greater personal demands on the DCI/DDCI and their small personal staffs.

Option B Prime -- Organizationally transfer the entire Office of Personnel to the DCI level.

Advantage: a. This would establish the DCI or DDCI as the Agency's principal personnel officer and assure that his views are implemented to the letter.

b. It would avoid any confusion arising from a bifurcation of personnel functions.

c. It would result in personnel matters being given greater attention at all levels in the Agency.

SUBJECT: NAPA Project Group Report, Tab D: Authorities of the Director of Personnel

Disadvantages: a. It would signal the DCI/DDCI's lack of confidence in the DDA and the Director of Personnel to properly administer the Agency's personnel system.

b. It would place greater personal demands on the DCI/DDCI and their small personal staffs.

c. It could focus attention too strongly on personnel matters to the detriment of other issues.

4. More basically, the most important conditions required to solve a personnel policy problem, or any problem for that matter, are an in-depth understanding of the problem, including its deleterious effects, and a cadre of capable people available to address it. Organizational aspects are of decidedly lesser significance. I urge, therefore, that we focus harder on the problem itself before we make precipitous organizational changes that at this point do not really guarantee any solutions.



✓ Leslie C. Dirks

STAT

cc: D/OP